

## Haggerty, Katie

---

**From:** Harland Christofferson <hchristo@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 09, 2015 5:07 PM  
**To:** JudTestimony  
**Subject:** SB 650

Judiciary Committee,

SB 650 would allow citizens gun rights to be stripped without due process of law. This legislation would require a sworn police officer to serve all ex parte temporary restraining orders when the applicant indicates on the application that the respondent has access to a firearm or ammunition, or holds a valid state-issued firearm or ammunition permit or eligibility certificate. An ex parte temporary restraining order is one where only one side, the applicant, makes a claim and doesn't have to appear in front of a judge before the order is issued. Upon the delivery of the order, the police officer would then immediately confiscate all legally owned firearms, ammunition, carry permits and eligibility certificates BEFORE a person has had a hearing before a court to determine the merits of the complaint made against them.

If firearms are confiscated erroneously or a court ultimately dismisses an order, and since a person does not have an immediate ability to have a hearing or right to be heard before a court before their firearms, ammunition, permits, certificates are taken, the wait is often as long as two years or longer to get firearms, ammunition certificates and permits returned. There is also, unfortunately, no reprisal for filing a false claim. This bill takes unnecessary steps to blatantly circumvent your rights. [There is also no provision to return any so-called "assault weapons" or "large capacity magazines". Once these are removed, even erroneously, they can not be returned to you. Even members of the anti-gun groups CAGV and CADV have testified in favor of return of firearms, and immediate reinstatement of pistol permits if ex parte orders were found invalid and vacated at an ensuing hearing.]

It is clear that the Governor and some legislators have only one interest -gun confiscation and limiting the rights of the law-abiding in Connecticut, as they have shown no interest in providing respondents with an opportunity to be heard before a judge ahead of losing their Second Amendment rights. In fact, this legislation even removes verbatim "an opportunity to be heard" from the current state statute that protects individuals in these circumstances today.

It's important for gun owners to have the opportunity to put up their own defense before losing their Second Amendment rights. This bill's low evidentiary standards and lack of a mechanism for individuals to present their own defense before being deprived of their constitutional rights is unacceptable.

I urge you to vote against SB 650.

Harland Christofferson  
Guilford